

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed October 6, 2011.

### **I. Interview Summary**

Applicant thanks Examiner Heffington for the courtesy of a telephone interview on April 4, 2012. During the telephone interview, Claims 1 and 76 were discussed. No agreement was reached during the interview.

### **II. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed October 6, 2011, Claims 1-5, 12-17, 34-38, 45-55, 62-67, 69-71 and 73-77 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 9, 13-17, 34-37, 42, 46-54, 59, 62-67, 69-71 and 73-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hutsch et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0034771 hereinafter Hutsch). Claims 5, 38 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutsch, in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0056026 hereinafter Anuff). Claims 12 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutsch, in view of Hoffman et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0069766 hereinafter Hoffman).

### **III. Summary of Applicant's Amendment**

The present Reply does not amend the claims, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-5, 12-17, 34-38, 45-55, 62-67, 69-71 and 73-77.

### **IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) & 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-4, 9, 13-17, 34-37, 42, 46-54, 59, 62-67, 69-71 and 73-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hutsch. Claims 5, 38 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutsch, in view of Anuff. Claims 12 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutsch, in view of Hoffman.

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the following:

1. *(Currently Amended) An interactive tool that can configure a portal, comprising:  
a first user interface operable to at least one of define and manage the portal,  
wherein the portal provides access to content in a virtual content repository (VCR), wherein*

*the VCR is a hierarchical representation of a plurality of individual content repositories such that the plurality of individual content repositories appear and behave as a single content repository, and wherein the portal is associated with a plurality of portal components and the first user interface uses a hierarchy to manage the plurality of portal components; and a second user interface operable to at least one of define and manage entitlement for said plurality of portal components, wherein each different portal components in said plurality of portal components can be associated with a different set of roles, and each different role in said different set of roles can be entitled with a different set of entitlement capabilities, wherein the second user interface allows a user to select a role from a set of roles for a portal component in said plurality of portal components, and the second user interface further allows the user to select different entitlement capabilities from a set of entitlement capabilities for said role selected by the user for said portal component; wherein the interactive tool runs on at least one processor.*

Hutsch discloses a network portal system that includes a web-top manager and a universal content broker system (Abstract). Hutsch further discloses that configuration server includes system configuration, policies, and/or device-specific settings, which means that various user roles with different access rights to system resources can be defined (Paragraph [0324]).

The system resources in Hutsch includes general hardware and software resources that reside on user devices (Paragraphs [0117]), and user documents and configuration data that are stored and managed in information system tier (Paragraph [0131]).

However, the portal resources as embodied in Claim 1 include a collection of portal components that provide a way to aggregate content and integrate applications and allow a visitor to a Website to access everything via a user interface.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claim 76**

Claim 76 has been amended to recite the following:

*76. (Previously Presented) The interactive tool of claim 1, wherein:  
the second user interface provides to a user a different set of entitlement capabilities for a same role selected by the user for different portal components.*

Hutsch discloses a network portal system that includes a web-top manager and a universal content broker system (Abstract). Hutsch further discloses that configuration server includes system configuration, policies, and/or device-specific settings, which means that various user roles with different access rights to system resources can be defined (Paragraph [0324]).

However, Hutsch concerns only the access rights to system resources as a whole for

various user roles, whereas the embodiment in Claim 76 allows a same user role to have a different set of entitlement capabilities for different portal components in the portal system.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 76 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**Claim 34, 51, and 77**

The comments provided above with regard to Claim 1 are herein incorporated by reference. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 34, 51, and 77 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination with other claims. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**Claims 2-5, 12-17, 35-38, 45-50, 52-55, 62-67, 69-71, and 73-75**

Claims 2-5, 12-17, 35-38, 45-50, 52-55, 62-67, 69-71, and 73-74 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 34 and 51. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed herewith is a Petition for Extension of time, together with the appropriate fee, extending the time to respond up to and including April 6, 2012.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 6, 2012

By: /Kuiran Liu/  
Kuiran Liu  
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No. 80548  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800